

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended by the present response to correct minor informalities and clarify certain language. The changes made to the specification are deemed to be self-evident from the original disclosure, and thus are not deemed to raise any issues of new matter.

Claims 1, 3, 7, and 8 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 4-6 are canceled by the present response without prejudice and new claims 7 and 8 are presented herewith.

Claims 4-6 were withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0076464 A1 to Ozawa et al. (herein “Ozawa”). Claims 1 and 3(1) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0025857 A1 to Ochiai et al. (herein “Ochiai”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0201799 A1 to Nakayoshi et al. (herein “Nakayoshi”).

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ozawa, that rejection is obviated by the present response.

The present application has a priority date of July 29, 2002, which precedes the filing date of September 25, 2002, of the Ozawa reference. To perfect applicants’ priority submitted herewith is a certified translation of applicants’ priority document. That certified translation is believed to fully support the claimed features. Thus, the present application is entitled to its priority date of July 29, 2002, thereby removing Ozawa as a valid reference against the pending claims.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1 and 3(1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Nakayoshi, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Claim 1 is amended by the present response to now incorporate limitations from dependent claim 2, and to even further define the extent of the “light shielding film”, which was not rejected over Ochiai in view of Nakayoshi.

Further, Nakayoshi is also not a valid reference against the pending claims as Nakayoshi was filed on January 21, 2003, which is subsequent to applicants’ now perfected priority date of July 29, 2002.

Thereby, the further rejection of claims 1 and 3(1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ochiai in view of Nakayoshi is also traversed by the present response.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit amended independent claim 1, and claim 3 dependent therefrom, are allowable.

The present response also sets forth new independent claim 7, and claim 8 dependent therefrom, for examination, which are also believed to be allowable for similar reasons as noted above.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/SNS:aif